

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application, claims 1, 2 and 9 having been amended herein.

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Arnhold et al..

### **Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Arnhold et al.. Applicant respectfully traverses these statements.

Applicant's representative has conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner and has reached an agreement as to the claim language for independent claims 1 and 9.

As per the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the term "structured and arranged for multi-dimensional movement" immediately following the term "suspending a selected weight" as recited above. Thus, claim 1 should be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-8 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and thus should also be allowable.

Also, as per the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to include the term "structured and arranged for multi-dimensional movement, said weight" immediately following the term "a selected weight." Thus, claim 9 should

be in condition for allowance. Claims 10-26 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and thus should also be allowable.

The advantages of a "suspended weight" over a weight that is only movable in one dimension or in one direction are obvious to a man of ordinary skill in the art and is exemplified in Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application.

Fig. 1 shows a size press 10 comprising a frame 14 and two size press rolls 1, 11. The rolls are in nip contact with each other. The nip contact and specifically any variation in the nip contact may cause vibrations. Now, e.g. if one or both of the rolls are replaced with another roll and if the diameter of the new roll is not the same as in the original roll, then at least the main direction of the vibrating movement is not the same as in the original assembly. The "suspended weight" as shown in Fig. 2 of the present application can adapt itself to the change in the direction of the vibrating movement. Conversely, in the system of Arnhold et al. the weight can only move in one direction and the weight cannot be adapted to the new direction of the vibrating movement.

In view of the above it is submitted that the Arnhold et al. references fails to anticipate and/or render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under §§ 102(b) and 103(a) is, therefore, respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments it is submitted that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

A petition for a three-month extension of time with the requisite fee is attached herewith. In the event that any other fees are required, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By:



Keith D. Moore  
Reg. No. 44,951

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.  
1140 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 768-3800